DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 079 281 SP 006 690

TITLE	[Information Package on "Accountability."]
INSTITUTION	National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	35p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Education Association, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. (No price quoted)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Accountability; Educational Practice; *Evaluation Criteria; National Surveys; *Program Effectiveness; Public Support; *School Responsibility; Teacher Responsibility

ABSTRACT

This document is an information package on accountability from the National Education Association (NEA). It is divided into three parts. Part one is a summary of the NEA conference on accountability, which made a number of unanimous recommendations for association action, including motions for program criteria, program evaluation, public information, and teacher training and certification. Part two is "Accountability," a speech by NEA executive secretary Terry Herndon, which advocates stopping the current destructive practices done in the name of accountability and encouraging good practices and good policy growing out of accountability phenomenon. Part three is composed of two large data sheets that present a survey of state activities on educational accountability derived from officials in state departments of education and state education associations. It is indicated that this document is as yet incomplete, presenting only a few details for each state, but it can serve as a composite of the state of the nation in accountability. (JA)

ED 079281

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION • 1201 16th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 • (202) 833-4000
MRS. CATHARINE BARRETT, President
TERRY HERNDON, Executive Secretary

June 25, 1973

MEMORANDUM TO: NEA Leaders

FROM: Robert C. Snider, secretary, Information Services Team, Instruction and Professional Development

SUBJ: Enclosed Information Package on "Accountability"

We are pleased to send you the enclosed materials dealing with the subject of educational accountability. This package is made up of the following four documents:

1. Summary of NEA Conference on Accountability (Denver, May 1973), 8 pp. Attended by representatives from 30 states, this work conference made a number of unanimous recommendations for association action.

2. Accountability, Speech by NEA Executive Secretary Terry Herndon. 11 pp.

3. Survey of State Laws/Decrees/Requirements/Activities Relating to Specific Areas Included in the Concept of Educational Accountability. Two large data sheets presenting a score card of state activities on educational accountability derived from officials in state departments of education and state education associations. The headings are labels in general use for most of the state actions taking place in the name of accountability. This working document, as yet incomplete, presents only a few details for each state, but it does serve as a composite of the state of the nation in accountability.

   As developments occur almost daily on some phase of accountability someplace, the score card is always incomplete as published. A more complete tabulation of these data, plus essential details, will be available in late summer as a part of A Manual on Standards and Developments Affecting School Personnel in the United States (tentative title), to be published by NEA/IPD.

4. Accountability in Education: An Annotated Bibliography. 6 pp.

This material represents the third information package sent to NEA leaders during the 1972-73 year. Last December our first mailing dealt with "Accountability;" our second package on "Instructional Innovation and the Local Association" was sent last March; and in September we expect to send you a fourth package on the topic of "Testing." Since effective communication is a two-way street, your comments and suggestions are invited. Thank you.

RCS:mc
Enclosure

SP 006 690

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 079281

SPEECH BY TERRY HERNDON ON ACCOUNTABILITY

NEA CONFERENCE ON ACCOUNTABILITY
DENVER, COLORADO
MAY 29-31, 1973

I want to offer greetings from President Barrett and the Board of Directors, the Executive Committee and the staff here in Washington. We are all very much concerned about the problem which you are addressing and we are grateful that so many people have been willing to share their time and their energy to help us formulate some marching orders in response to the accountability thrust that has come upon us. We all see it; it is taking many different shapes; it appears in many different forms. It's a very mercurial kind of thing and is difficult to keep up with. It shows up in one place as assessment tests, and the same public interests and prejudices show elsewhere as performance-based certification. In still other places voucher programs are very big. Parochiaid, performance objectives that are being foisted on teachers in some places, repeal of tenure, all of these seem to be the same basic public reaction to concerns about schools.

One of the questions frequently asked is whether or not this public interest is reasonable. Some ask if it's reasonable; others ask if it's unreasonable. I'm not at all certain that we need to spend a great deal of time on that question. Whether it be reasonable or unreasonable, there's a developing chorus of voices crying out for an accounting for the investment in schools, principally public schools. That outcry, wherever it appears, is very real whether it is reasonable or unreasonable.

SP 006 690

The fact that it is there means that we must respond to it in some meaningful and, hopefully, aggressive and effective way; because if we cannot respond in that way we might very likely be rolled over by the juggernaut.

The motives of the people who raise the issue are probably very good--there are many right-thinking people on the bandwagon--people who have a sincere desire for better schools, a sincere desire for more effective teaching. Some of those people are coming from our own ranks. But it does appear that as we move from the right thinkers who initiate the interest to the actual implementation, we run into the ranks of bureaucrats who are more concerned about scapegoating and passing out blame than with the original altruistic motives of the good people who want to see better schools. We can categorize these people--we see the corporate interests that are called into task forces to study school problems, we see politicians, we see school boards, we see administrators. Only rarely do we see a politician say that the schools are not performing as well as they ought to because the state legislators have not provided the funds that should have been provided, or that we have not provided the certification standards that should have been provided, or somehow or other the legislature has failed in terms of its responsibility. They look outward instead and they talk about school boards, administrators and teachers. Then the school boards get on the accountability craze. They fail to look to themselves and say the schools are not as effective as they ought to be because we as the school

board have failed to dedicate time and energy to defining our purpose and providing the means --because we failed to compensate our teachers adequately, because we failed to provide adequate classroom arrangements or whatever. They too scapegoat and pass it on the administrators and teachers. When the administrators get through with the scapegoating, the whole matter comes to rest on the back of the teacher.

The story seems to be an old one. We sometimes talk about this as a new phenomenon, but as I thought about this particular conference I recalled an article that I read in the NEA Journal many years ago. My research indicates that it was March 1968. The name of the article was "A Harlem Parent Speaks." This parent began the article by saying "I was an elevator operator and handyman. I'd come home every night to the wife and kids, eat dinner and look at TV." Later, he says, Parents want to be involved in their child's education and they want to see a job done. They're not so hung up against teachers as you may think, but teachers are the only thing that is close enough for them to attack. We know that the board of education sets the rules and we've got to play by them. But we also know that when we've asked the teachers to come out and try to help change some of the rules and they didn't do that, we had to attack the teachers. A school may have the best teachers in the world, but if the kids aren't learning, the only thing I can blame is the teachers." So speaks a parent, quoted as far back as 1968. It is simple reality that that's where many of the parents are. They have difficulty with the school institution, they have difficulty with the politicians, they have

difficulty with school boards, with administrators, difficulty with rules and regulations. But they know where there's a teacher. They know there's a teacher in contact with their child, and that's something that's close at hand. That's something they perceive, they believe, they understand--that's something which they can attack because of its proximity to their reality. So in the final analysis, the accountability issue is real, the public interest is real, and without getting into any quibbling about its reasonableness or unreasonableness, we simply have to respond to it in a meaningful and effective way. That response will probably have to be more complicated than a simple "yes" or "no."

If we look at the history of the issue in our organization we will find that the delegates to the NEA convention have already underscored their support for reasonable, meaningful accountability patterns. Continuing Resolution 6, adopted at the last convention, talks about the major responsibility of educators to participate in the evaluation of their services. It goes on to talk about the evaluation that should be conducted for the purpose of improvement of performance and quality of instruction offered to pupils. But that resolution is set in the context of a package of resolutions that also calls for fully-certified teachers and standards set by the profession, freedom from non-teaching duties, and safe, helpful and attractive classroom space, teacher-selected material in specified and required quantities, materials that accurately reflect the ethnic contributions of all people, the contributions of all ethnic groups; adequate salaries for the teachers to relieve them of the

need to work on into the night to try to provide for their families, security for teachers through tenure, and written personnel policies and retirement; and also, very importantly in my judgment, meaningful parental involvement in determination of school programs. Set in that context, teachers, their delegates, their representatives, have embraced very aggressive and meaningful accountability programs.

But that's not embracing accountability no matter what form it takes because,as I indicated the difference between the rhetoric and the application is very real. The application we see in schools and states right now suggests that there is a very serious neglect of the affective domain of learning and some of the more subtle considerations of the sociology and the psychology of the school setting, the classroom. Simply because t is so much easier to measure the effective schooling--the reading, writing, arithmetic--because these things are quantifiable. Those which are not quantifiable which are very important to teachers and children, the schools, and the society tend to be set aside as we focus on those things that are quantifiable. We also find in many cases that the position of this program, or the implementation of it, imposes very artificial and frequently arbitrary, capricious and irrelevant constraints on the quality of the student-teacher relationship and,therefore,on the quality of the learning program which the children are getting in the schools. As I indicated earlier, we find that in the implementation teachers become the final scapegoat as the total burden of the process comes to rest on their shoulders. We find

that most of the accountability systems being instituted across the United States are borrowed from industry, borrowed from the industrial/commercial or military establishments. We find that they are totally irrelevant management systems for most of what is taking place in basically social institutions like schools. We find in the implementation all manner of spurious reporting and the establishment of relationships or suggestion of relationships that simply cannot be substantiated. Data about the production of schools is reported to the community by comparing schools, and even though on a percental ranking one school appears to be dramatically worse than another, the fact is that in absolute scores they are relatively close. The community, in interpreting the data they see in the newspaper, begin rushing to make conclusions about the relationship between those data and the quality of the schools in which their children are enrolled. And that's simply not a proven relationship--in most cases it is not a valid relationship; yet, if that is not the valid relationship, then there's no point in reporting the data in the first place. We're now finding in some states that these data are being reported on a classroom basis, so the teacher's professional destiny, his standing in the community, his relationship with the pupils becomes a direct function of assumed relationship between data related to the group of students in that class and the performance of that teacher. That is absolutely wrong, it is unacceptable, and it's one of the fallouts of this whole accounting movement that we want to brand to be absolutely intolerable.

Further, we have the reactionary responses as the data piles up and as people suggest relationships between teacher performance and those data. The teacher becomes the ultimate scapegoat. The automatic solution becomes doing something about that teacher, rather than looking at any of the infinite number of variables that create the teaching circumstance.

So it seems to me that as you gather as a representative group of professional practitioners, a group with data at hand in terms of this whole accountability phenomenon, that you have to pursue at least two strategies and a third major question. One strategy is how to stop the destructive practices that are occurring in the name of accountability. A second strategy needs to be developed, however, so it might encourage the good practices that are growing out of the accountability phenomenon. We must also develop the policy base and the perspective of the practicing classroom teacher as to how one discriminates the good systems from the bad systems. Identify those that have more good than evil to suggest.

I would hope in addressing those strategies that you would give very serious attention to the tactics which we have demonstrated that we can use and use very effectively. It seems to me that those tactics are public information programs, collective bargaining back home in the local school district, political involvement and legislative influence at the state and the federal level, and other related forms of concerted activities by teachers. I believe that one of the reason that we have been somewhat less effective than we might have been in dealing

with the whole phenomenon of accountability is that we have not dedicated sufficient energy to searching out how these tactics which we have used can be utilized in terms of a campaign relating to accountability. Certainly we have to develop the public message that's going to be fed into a public information program. Over the years the schools have been very flexible, or shall we say unstable, institutions, largely because the public is very fickle in their evaluation of the schools. One craze, one trend after another captures us and the school becomes captured and the teachers get on board. Perhaps we need to develop a very stable message about what the schools are doing and what they will be doing and stick to that message over time without regard to whirlwinds that spring up about us only to burn themselves out in a matter of a few years. Certainly the core of that message could be an adaptation of the words of Dr. Martin Luther King, who once said in regard to the whole American society, "we're not as good as we ought to be, and we're not as good as we're going to be but, thank God, we're not as bad as we used to be." And that may be true with the public schools. We should cease contending that we're going to fulfill effectively today all of the demands that have been heaped upon us by fickle society, and we should cease contending that we can be all things to all people and that whatever new social pressure or social fad comes along we can handle it, and simply demonstrate (and I'm sure the data are available) that the schools are not as good as they ought to be, and they're not as good as they're going to be, but they are a great deal better than they've ever been before. I believe that can be substantiated.

I will make a few closing comments now about concerted action because I am coming to believe that there is a new dimension to concerted activity that we have not talked about before. It may, in fact, spin us off into a whole new area of tactics or strategy by simply increasing our sophistication in terms of concerted action.

Historically, we have developed plans and strategies of concerted action to make somebody else do something. We have tried to generate the power to deal with people who had authority that we did not have. By our own action we could not make things happen, but perhaps if we could generate sufficient power, we could make those with the authority to do it, do it our way. It seems to me that we may have arrived at the point in time as an organization, as an organized profession, when we can upgrade that concerted action and begin to presume jurisdiction over certain kinds of questions. The presumption of jurisdiction is going to require a very high level of discipline among our members. I would ask your conference to carefully consider whether or not we have arrived at the point in time where we have sufficient discipline among our ranks to presume to have jurisdiction over some questions such as testing. Has the time come when the National Education Association might establish some kind of a testing center, some kind of a center which, like the AMA in dealing with hospitals, colleges, etc., accredits the tests to be used in public schools, or to be used by the members of our profession; so that the test makers, or test buyers, or whoever, who wished to have a test put into use must come to the profession to secure the accreditation of the instrument. Because the profession will

not utilize those which are unaccredited, but will use widely those which have been accredited for the purposes that are set forth in the accreditation. It seems to me that if we have discipline to mount this kind of a program and to enforce this kind of a program, that we might even hopefully make it a self funding kind of program by requiring those who wish to market tests to provide us with the funds that are necessary to accredit or not to accredit their particular instrument. I don't know if we've arrived there today, but it seems to me that the kind of leadership you have present at the conference in Denver might well be able to make an enlightened judgment about that possibility.

In closing I would simply suggest to you that you have a task before you that is very much like the task that we have had regarding other issues. We need to collect good information and good data about what exactly is happening in the world. We need to make good policy decisions that are responsive to the reality that those data suggest, and then we need to set about the task of organizing because that's what we do best--organizing to influence the people that are imposing this upon us.

I'll close with a very unsophisticated poem by a fellow named Elly Nelson, a poem called a "Dreamer's Gold." He simply asserts that, "It's fun to sit on a powder keg and wonder which will fly higher, an arm or a leg. I think that may be where we are with accountability. It may not seem like so much fun, but if we exploit it, it may be an interesting and exciting opportunity for us. We on the staff, the organizers, the ones

who hopefully try to make it work are awaiting the marching orders that will begin to develop in this conference. Thank you for your patience; I do not know what kind of questions you may have, but I'll try to answer them and, if I can't, you can put them on a list.

May 29, 1973

ED 079281

SUMMARY OF NEA CONFERENCE ON ACCOUNTABILITY
DENVER, COLORADO, MAY 29-31, 1973

Co-Chairmen: Melvin Leasure, Chairman, National Council on Instruction and Professional Development

William M. Mondale, Chairman, NEA Committee on Accountability

CONFERENCE ASSUMPTIONS

1. Adequate programs to deal with accountability can be developed only with practitioner involvement, particularly with classroom teachers; practitioners are the only source of some of the information needed for making intelligent decisions and practitioners are vital agents for effective implementation.

2. Our response to the accountability issue should be in terms of professional responsibility rather than reaction against any current models proposed or in operation. In this response there should be a delineation of professional decision areas in contrast to decision areas for which others outside the profession are responsible.

3. Professional practitioners are aware of the lack of definitive research and hard knowledge to guide day-by-day practice. It is assumed that in many cases there is an inverse ratio between what is measured and what is important in education. There is a very real danger that the aims of education will be increasingly restricted to those which can be most easily measured, rather than those which are most important.

ACCOUNTABILITY: ISSUES AND ACTION

In response to the membership's growing concern with the impact on classroom teachers of accountability measures already adopted or proposed in well over half the States and rapidly proliferating, a work conference was called in Denver on May 29-31 to clarify the issues arising out of the accountability movement and to delineate workable action programs for presentation to the Representative Assembly. The urgency of the situation as perceived by the NEA executive and staff was underlined by the unanimous support accorded the conference aims by the Board of Directors, the Executive Committee, the Council on Instruction and Professional Development, the National Council of State Education Associations, and the North Central Regional Advisory Council.

SP 006 690

The tone of the conference was set early in the first session by NEA Executive Secretary Terry Herndon, who told participants: "Whether it be reasonable or unreasonable, the outcry for various kinds of accounting for the investment in schools is very real... We must respond to it in some meaningful, effective, and hopefully aggressive way."

Analysis of the accountability phenomenon revealed that the thrust manifests itself in myriad forms, appearing here as performance-based certification and there as a voucher program, touching along the way virtually the full gamut of professional concerns, from the fundamental goals of public education to bread-and-butter issues. Yet despite these complexities and variations, the conference deliberations clearly focused on a common, underlying concern: The tendency, by intent or not, for accountability programs to impose on the classroom teacher final responsibility for educational outcomes without yielding concomitant authority to contribute to the decisions on policy, resource allocation, and other factors which affect those outcomes or to determine the methods by which outcomes are weighed.

The theme of the action recommendations proposed by the Denver Accountability Conference, therefore, is not a retreat from accountability but a counterthrust toward a more comprehensive approach. Taken as a whole, the recommendations call on the NEA leadership

and staff, with appropriate practitioner involvement,[1] to define and advocate broadly based and realistic accountability measures through which all participants in the educational process, at all levels of decision making, may be held responsible to the extent of their authority for the effectiveness of their respective contributions to those aims of education an informed public deems most important rather than merely those most readily measured.

The Denver Accountability Conference recommends unanimously that the National Education Association undertake the following coordinated actions to address major issues in the area of accountability:

I. CRITERIA FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAMS

Provide criteria and procedures for the creation of plans for accountability programs that will (1) assign accountability to the involved parties in relation to their power to effect change, clearly defining the teacher's role and the parameters of his responsibility; and (2) assist state and local associations' accountability plans to be implemented in local jurisdictions and state departments, and through legislative action related to education.

---

[1]The terms "practitioner involvement" and "membership involvement" will be defined by each state or local association choosing to obtain member involvement. For clarity in this document, membership involvement is meant to meet these criteria:

a) Involvement of practicing teachers in such a way that the teachers represent the positions established by their constituencies and the decisions resulting from their involvement reflect the concerns of their constituencies

b) The selection of such members is in the hands of the recognized teacher organizations.

Mount a legislative program which will result in (1) teacher involvement in policy formation and implementation of any federal program impinging on accountability, and (2) intervention by NEA to modify or forestall any legislation which forces industrial-type models of accountability upon the schools.

II. PROGRAM EVALUATION

Evaluate existing and proposed accountability programs in the States in terms including, but not limited to, the following criteria: reciprocity; decentralization; negotiation by the parties involved; and inclusion of a statement of expectations to be met as a result of implementation of the program.

Establish, with membership involvement, criteria, principles and procedures for program evaluation.

III. PUBLIC INFORMATION

Expose the accountability issue as the responsibility of all parties in the educational enterprise.

Lead a national effort, involving NEA members together with various elements of the public, to refocus the purposes of the schools and to determine realistic price tags to support such purposes.

Promote the establishment of minimum standards for the maintenance of public education programs, and publicize the results of applying these standards to school districts.

Tie together the mounting evidence that external forces such as federal funding, narrowly conceived guidelines, and the imposition of industrial models are impigning upon the school systems

III. PUBLIC INFORMATION (continued)

in ways which interfere with the local control of education.

Mount programs to acquaint organized community groups, parent groups, organized labor, students, and others with the wide array of means of judging the worth of schools which do not lend themselves to quantification but are essential in determining the value of schools.

Research and report to members both abuses occurring in the name of accountability, including attempts to impose industrial management models on the social environment of schools, and those alternative practices which make a clear contribution to public education.

IV. ASSOCIATION LEADERSHIP TRAINING

Undertake the education of all NEA members as to the nature and scope of the accountability crisis.

Initiate leadership training programs to develop the action capability of local units through such means as the updating of state and local IPD Councils on accountability training; the sponsorship of ten regional conferences, with a proportional minority representation, on specific related topics; and the formation of an Action Study Group to define possibilities and entry points for action programs in the area of accountability, to provide informational vehicles, and to train local staff for implementation.

Develop recommendations for legislative action at all levels, including collective bargaining, and other necessary actions to implement productive practices and disallow abusive practices in accountability.

V. TEACHER TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION

Establish a policy of practitioner involvement in the certification process at all levels.

Develop a position and evaluative criteria on Competency Based Teacher Education and Competency Based Teacher Certification.

Establish minimum criteria for the preparation and retraining of professional educators, and provide accreditation for teacher training programs meeting NEA requirements, with emphasis on continued improvement in the quality of instruction through such programs as teacher renewal centers. Inservice training should grow from needs identified through evaluation and should be paid for by the school district.

Identify certification rationale for all types of preservice programs (e.g., intern, fifth year) using the public schools for clinical experience, requiring that such programs be subject to negotiated agreement between and among the parties involved, i.e., the teacher preparation institution, the local school district, the local teachers association, and the preservice students.

VI. CERTIFICATED STAFF EVALUATION

Develop, with vigorous membership involvement, criteria for assessing the principles, procedures, and instruments used in evaluating certificated professional personnel.

Initiate efforts to determine the effectiveness and limitations of present methods of evaluation in relation to the ultimate aim of improving instruction, and to develop appropriate means of objectively evaluating the performance of all educators as called for by NEA Continuing Resolution C-6.

VII. STANDARDIZED TESTING

Certify acceptable standardized tests, and monitor the usage of standardized testing.

VIII. MOBILITY

Undertake a major study to define the relationships and effects of the accelerating mobility of students and teachers on such aspects of accountability as certification, evaluation, needs assessment, and tenure; inform the leadership at all levels of the findings; and develop policy and programs based on the findings.

IX. COMMUNITY CONTROL/DECENTRALIZATION

Consider the implications of, and develop a position in regard to, the concepts of community control and decentralization as they relate to and affect accountability.

PROPOSED REVISION OF RESOLUTION 72-32. ACCOUNTABILITY

72-32. Accountability

The National Education Association recognizes that the term "accountability," as applied to public education is subject to varied interpretations. The Association maintains that educational excellence for each child is the objective of the education system. The Association believes that educators can be accountable only to the degree that they share responsibility in educational decision-making and to the degree that other parties who share this responsibility--legislators, other government officials, school boards, parents, students, and taxpayers--are also held accountable.

Pending the development of a complete accountability system, the National Education Association will oppose any activity in which a limited assessment is interpreted as an overall measure of the effectiveness of public education. (Underlining denotes new portion.)

Survey of State Laws/
Activities Relating to S
the Concept of Educat

	TEACHER EVALUATION	IN-SERVICE EDUCATION	TEACHER CENTERS	TEN
NEW HAMPSHIRE	Obliquely required - via Staff Development Design	State approved local plans - Staff Development Design	USOE nominations; Staff Development Design; Southern N.H. Staff Dev. Coop.	Fair
NEW JERSEY	Legislation introduced - for non-tenure teachers	Local	Trenton State College (?)	Ten
NEW MEXICO	Legislation 1969; State Board Resolution 1970	Allowed toward certificate renewal. Discussion under way on c.-b. re-certification.	No	Ten
NEW YORK	No	St. Bd. plan adopted 11/72. Fifth-year required for continuing certification	Discussion; implication in state plan	Ten legi ed c
NORTH CAROLINA	In tenure law - for permanent certification	State approved local plans	4 USOE nominations. Pilots to validate competency	Ten
NORTH DAKOTA	Legislation introduced for Prof'l Practices Com'n authority.	Add'l credits required for certificate renewal (adm) or accreditation (teachers)	Univ. of N.D.	Fair latio law
OHIO		Add'l credits required for advanced certification	Cleveland St. U.-Beechwood Defiance Col.-Napolean/Defiance	Cor laws
OKLAHOMA	Local	Local	No	Cor
OREGON	SB 131, 1971 - districts over 500 ADM; legislation to be introduced covering all teachers	Efforts toward state voluntary plan thru prof'l organizations	No	Ten and ten
PENNSYLVANIA	By law - nontenure teachers	Allowed toward required perm. certification. In-service for all top St. Dept. priority.	None officially recognized. Regional consortium - 21 districts, 8 colleges. Susquehanna - planning.	Ter
RHODE ISLAND	Local	Fifth year required for professional certification	R.I. Teacher Center proposal	Ter
SOUTH CAROLINA	Legislation being drafted	No	No	Leg
SOUTH DAKOTA	By law - prof'l practices commission responsibility	Additional credits required for certificate renewal	USOE nominations. 3 St. Dept. learning centers	Con tion tion
TENNESSEE	Some local. 1972 legislative resolution for development of formula. TEA requested State Board requirement for prob'y teachers.	Law requires 10 days in state approved plan	No	Ten law
TEXAS	Local	Law requires 10 days	Renewal centers in 5 universities	
UTAH			Teacher education consortia in	Bill

Decrees/Requirements/ Specific Areas Included in tional Accountability

NURE/CONT'G CONTRACT	P.-B. CERTIFICATION	PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	TEACHER NEEDS ASSMT.
r dismissal act	For credential renewal.	Not statewide.	Local, under Staff Dev. Design
nure law	Feasibility study under way.	No	No
nure law	State Dept studying - interim report filed - no legislation anticipated.	No	St. Dept. Evaluation Unit
nure law. Continuing contract islation proposed but not report- out of cte.	State Board plan adopted 11/72 commits institutions to begin introducing p-b teacher education 9/73. Reading competence required of elementary teachers.	State Board of Regents Plan for Post-Secondary Education. Reading competency requirements.	
nure law	C.-b. programs adopted by State Board	Being developed	Being developed
r dismissal law; amending legis- ion pending. Continuing contract v.	Colleges moving toward modified form of p.-b. TE. Legislation pending to make Prof'l Practices Com'n advisory to State Board on certification.	No	No formal study
ntinuing contract and tenure vs.	Experience requirements for adm/ supv certificates. U. of Toledo p.-b. program.	For upgrading certificates	
ntinuing contract law.	Approved-program approach.	Two state conferences; another planned.	NEA
nure (districts over 4500 ADM) d continuing contracts. Overall nure legislation introduced.	New regulations effective 1974 involve p.-b. teacher education.	Standards of Performance for Oregon Educators, adopted 1970.	By Practices Commission
enure law	State requires approved program. Effective 6/72 all programs must be c.-b.	Approval standards	Bargaining law - negotiation for needs
enure law	Certification Advisory Cte working on p.-b. concept.	No	St Dept program to establish goals via task force. RI Teacher Center-Needs Assmt. questionnaire.
egislation being drafted	No	No	No
ontinuing contract law. Legisla- on expected 1973 for "clarifica- on" or repeal	Through approved-program approach. State Dept has full-time employee to develop plan.	Yes	Not statewide
enure law. Continuing contract w	Under study	Under study	Not statewide
	New teacher education stds will be p.-b.; passed	Being developed	No
ill pending for orderly termination assed. St Dept has rec'd cont'g ont.	State approved program at Weber State College; experimental programs at other univs.	For media specialist only. Weber - competency-based. ISTEP - Brigham Young.	St.Bd. assessments, to upgrade state programs.

NORTH DAKOTA	Legislation introduced for Prof'l Practices Com'n authority.	Add'l credits required for certificate renewal (adm) or accreditation (teachers)	Univ. of N.D.	Fair dismis lation pend law.
OHIO		Add'l credits required for advanced certification	Cleveland St. U.-Beechwood Defiance Col.-Napolean/Defiance	Continuing laws.
OKLAHOMA	Local	Local	No	Continuing
OREGON	SB 131, 1971 - districts over 500 ADM; legislation to be introduced covering all teachers	Efforts toward state voluntary plan thru prof'l organizations	No	Tenure (dis and contin tenure legis
PENNSYLVANIA	By law - nontenure teachers	Allowed toward required perm. certification. In-service for all top St. Dept. priority.	None officially recognized. Regional consortium - 21 districts, 8 colleges. Susquehanna - planning.	Tenure law
RHODE ISLAND	Local	Fifth year required for professional certification	R.I. Teacher Center proposal	Tenure law
SOUTH CAROLINA	Legislation being drafted	No	No	Legislation
SOUTH DAKOTA	By law - prof'l practices commission responsibility	Additional credits required for certificate renewal	USOE nominations. 3 St. Dept. learning centers	Continuing tion expect tion" or repe
TENNESSEE	Some local. 1972 legislative resolution for development of formula. TEA requested State Board requirement for prob'y teachers.	Law requires 10 days in state approved plan	No	Tenure law law
TEXAS	Local	Law requires 10 days	Renewal centers in 5 universities	
UTAH	No - local	Allowed for recertification	Teacher education consortia in planning stage in 3 areas of state.	Bill pending passed. St cont.
VERMONT	For certificate renewal	Allowed for certificate issuance and renewal in approved local program	EPDA project. Staff Development Cooperative (New Eng. Project in TE). Local evaluation agencies.	No
VIRGINIA	1972 - Standards of Quality	Allowed toward certificate renewal		Tenure law law)
WASHINGTON	By law - annually	1971 Guidelines & Stds when fully implemented establish in-service for all professionals.	May exist as 1971 Guidelines are implemented	Continuing
WEST VIRGINIA	Local	State and local plan. Planning application of p.-b. in continuing education.	Implemented through colleges and universities.	Tenure law
WISCONSIN	For unlimited certificate	5 days required.	State conference - under EPDA. Ten institutions developing consortia. Three districts developing centers.	Tenure in M ing contract
WYOMING	Under State Board school eval/ accred'n program	Local. Allowed toward recertification.	No	Tenure law tract provisi

Fair dismissal law; amending legislation pending. Continuing contract law.	Colleges moving toward modified form of p.-b. TE. Legislation pending to make Prof'l Practices Com'n advisory to State Board on certification.	No	No formal study
Continuing contract and tenure laws.	Experience requirements for adm/supv certificates. U. of Toledo p.-b. program.	For upgrading certificates	
Continuing contract law.	Approved-program approach.	Two state conferences; another planned.	NEA
Tenure (districts over 4500 ADM) and continuing contracts. Overall tenure legislation introduced.	New regulations effective 1974 involve p.-b. teacher education.	Standards of Performance for Oregon Educators, adopted 1970.	By Practices Commission
Tenure law	State requires approved program. Effective 6/72 all programs must be c.-b.	Approval standards	Bargaining law - negotiation f needs
Tenure law	Certification Advisory Cte working on p.-b. concept.	No	St Dept program to establish goa via task force. RI Teacher Cente Needs Assmt. questionnaire.
Legislation being drafted	No	No	No
Continuing contract law. Legislation expected 1973 for "clarification" or repeal	Through approved-program approach. State Dept has full-time employee to develop plan.	Yes	Not statewide
Tenure law. Continuing contract law	Under study	Under study	Not statewide
	New teacher education stds will be p.-b.; passed	Being developed	No
Bill pending for orderly termination passed. St Dept has rec'd cont'g cont.	State approved program at Weber State College; experimental programs at other univs.	For media specialist only. Weber - competency-based. ISTEP - Brigham Young.	St.Bd. assessments, to upgrad state programs.
No	Program approval is performance based. Local Evaluation Agency component of cert'n regulations. Paraprofessional certification.	No	Required through local eval'n process for school approval.
Tenure law (continuing contract law)	No.	No	1970 - for planning
Continuing contract law	1971 Guidelines & Stds	When developed by consortia under 1971 Guidelines & Stds.	NEA
Tenure law	Under discussion.	No	No
Tenure in Milwaukee Cty. Continuing contract in state.	Through approved-program approach.	No	EPDA Part II
Tenure law and continuing contract provisions.	Discussion. St Dept and Univ. examining developments.	No	St Dept-Univ of Wyo coop project on school needs assessment includes teachers.

	STUDENT NEEDS ASSMT.	STANDARDIZED TESTING	SCH. PROGRAM EVAL'N
NEW HAMPSHIRE	Title III	Voluntary	Implications in Staff Development Design. New minimum stds for elementary schools
NEW JERSEY	St. Bd. Needs Assmt. Council. Title III. Legislation introduced.	Reading, math - gr. 4, 12 - 1972. Legislation pending for school district evaluation.	School Improvement Program - field tested
NEW MEXICO	No	Grades 6-12	Senate resolution - local eva'n ctes. Accreditation
NEW YORK	St Dept Guidelines for Student Rights/Resp.		
NORTH CAROLINA	St Dept - 6th grade testing to establish norms	Voluntary	Emerging pattern - unit-wide assment, system-wide planning
NORTH DAKOTA	Title III	St. testing program not related to needs assessment.	Accreditation
OHIO	HB 475		Attn to on-site eval'n based on min. stds. HB 475
OKLAHOMA	Local - remedial reading, learning disabilities	Local. Legislation defeated	Local
OREGON	No	No	New accred'g stds effective 1973
PENNSYLVANIA	S.290.1 Sch. Dist. Reorganization Act, 1963	Grades 5, 11 - voluntary	Elem. curriculum requirements. Secondary accred'n.
RHODE ISLAND	St Dept program to establish goals. Ch. 49, S.16, 1969; more legislation in 1973	Ch. 16-22 amended, 1963 - aptitude, intelligence	Extensive St. Dept. eval'n of elem. schs.
SOUTH CAROLINA	No		No
SOUTH DAKOTA	Title III - 1973	No	Accreditation
TENNESSEE	Not statewide	Not statewide	St. Bd. reg'n - annual local curric. conf. (general type of eval'n)
TEXAS	No	No	Accreditation
UTAH	St. Bd. assessments, to upgrade state programs	Legislation pending; killed	No (but certain categories must be approved for funding)
VERMONT	Required through local eval'n process for school approval.	No - not statewide	Local approval process
VIRGINIA	1972 Standards of Quality		1972 Standards of Quality. Federal programs. Accreditation.
	Title III		St. Bd. Goals for Common Schools, 1972. New prog. approval, design

SCH. PROGRAM EVAL'N	GOALS/OBJECTIVES	MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	RELATIONSHIP TO ST. FUNDING
Implications in Staff Development Design. New minimum stds for elementary schools	Staff Dev. Design. Min. Elem. Stds.	No	
School Improvement Program - field tested	"Our Schools" program	St. budget based on PPBS but moving away. 4 districts experimenting with PPBS. Edl Improvement Centers geared to PPBS	None
Senate resolution - local eva'n ctes. Accreditation	Senate resolution. St. Bd. has adopted goals/objs	St. Dept. fiscal division	Implications in Ch.180, 1969 - accreditation
Emerging pattern - unit-wide assment, system-wide planning		Being developed at local unit level	None
Accreditation	Part of accred'n	Some districts moving toward	None
Attn to on-site eval'n based on min. stds. HB 475	HB 475	HB 475 - MIS	None
Local	Developing plan. Account'y activities.	In St. Dept. - each section has goals/objectives.	
New accred'g stds effective 1973	Legislation being introduced	St. Dept. task force	Funding based on min. stds.
Elem. curriculum requirements. Secondary accred'n.	Goals of Quality Educ.	No	None
Extensive St. Dept. eval'n of elem. schs.	Ch. 49, 1969 - reorg. of St. Dept.	Ch. 49, 1969	
No		No	Encouraging MBO to substantiate increased funding.
Accreditation	Part of accred'n	Some local activity. St. Dept. using MBO and encouraging local use	
St. Bd. reg'n - annual local curric. conf. (general type of eval'n)	Gov. has requested St. Dept. to develop	Not statewide	N/A
Accreditation	St. Bd. adopts		Undergoing restudy with Rodriquez case. Overturned by Supr. Ct.
No (but certain categories must be approved for funding)	St Bd adopted obj., established priorities.	St Dept - PPBS	Finance is largely state operation.
Local approval process	Local - voluntary	No	
1972 Standards of Quality. Federal programs. Accreditation.		No	

NORTH DAKOTA	Title III	St. testing program not related to needs assessment.	Accreditation
OHIO	HB 475		Attn to on-site eval'n based on min. stds. HB 475
OKLAHOMA	Local - remedial reading, learning disabilities	Local. Legislation defeated	Local
OREGON	No	No	New accred'g stds effective 1973
PENNSYLVANIA	S.290.1 Sch. Dist. Reorganization Act, 1963	Grades 5, 11 - voluntary	Elem. curriculum requirements. Secondary accred'n.
RHODE ISLAND	St Dept program to establish goals. Ch. 49, S.16, 1969; more legislation in 1973	Ch. 16-22 amended, 1963 - aptitude, intelligence	Extensive St. Dept. eval'n of elem. schs.
SOUTH CAROLINA	No		No
SOUTH DAKOTA	Title III - 1973	No	Accreditation
TENNESSEE	Not statewide	Not statewide	St. Bd. reg'n - annual local curric. conf. (general type of eval'n)
TEXAS	No	No	Accreditation
UTAH	St. Bd. assessments, to upgrade state programs	Legislation pending; killed	No (but certain categories must be approved for funding)
VERMONT	Required through local eval'n process for school approval.	No - not statewide	Local approval process
VIRGINIA	1972 Standards of Quality		1972 Standards of Quality. Federal programs. Accreditation.
WASHINGTON	Title III Statewide - 4th and 6th grade reading, math; Pilot for assessing outcomes.	No	St. Bd. Goals for Common Schools, 1972. New prog. approval design. Reassessing secondary accreditation. Exploring local assmt model. USOE Exp. Sch. Project. Workshops
WEST VIRGINIA	Mandatory participation in statewide testing in academic areas.	Annually in designated grades/subjects. Norm-ref. testing in basics	Accreditation
WISCONSIN	Title III Ch. 125, L. 1971, Educational . . . . . Assessment - planning stage.	At several grade levels	Developing plan. Pilot in reading assmt. Min. Stds for state aid.
WYOMING	St Dept-Univ program. Legislation to be introduced in 1973.	Tests being developed; sampling scheduled 1973.	Accreditation. Developing plan based on local needs assmt and goals/objs. St. Dept - for planning.

Accreditation	Part of accred'n	Some districts moving toward	None
Attn to on-site eval'n based on min. stds. HB 475	HB 475	HB 475 - MIS	None
Local	Developing plan. Account'y activities.	In St. Dept. - each section has goals/objectives.	
New accred'g stds effective 1973	Legislation being introduced	St. Dept. task force	Funding based on min. stds.
Elem. curriculum requirements. Secondary accred'n.	Goals of Quality Educ.	No	None
Extensive St. Dept. eval'n of elem. schs.	Ch. 49, 1969 - reorg. of St. Dept.	Ch. 49, 1969	
No		No	Encouraging MBO to substantiate increased funding.
Accreditation	Part of accred'n	Some local activity. St. Dept. using MBO and encouraging local use	
St. Bd. reg'n - annual local curric. conf. (general type of eval'n)	Gov. has requested St. Dept. to develop	Not statewide	N/A
Accreditation	St. Bd. adopts		Undergoing restudy with Rodriquez case. Overturned by Supr. Ct.
No (but certain categories must be approved for funding)	St Bd adopted obj., established priorities.	St Dept - PPBS	Finance is largely state operation.
Local approval process	Local - voluntary	No	
1972 Standards of Quality. Federal programs. Accreditation.		No	
St. Bd. Goals for Common Schools, 1972. New prog. approval design. Reassessing secondary accreditation. Exploring local assmt model. USOE Exp. Sch. Project. Workshops	Exploring	PPBS try-out in variety of state agencies	Will require local system.
Accreditation	St. Dept. Comprehensive Education Program	Under discussion	Part of state funding based on implementation of CEP.
Developing plan. Pilot in reading assmt. Min. Stds for state aid.	St. Dept. task force developed goals in 1972.		
Accreditation. Developing plan based on local needs assmt and goals/objs. St. Dept - for planning.	Developing plan	St. Dept. implementing system to support revised OE Handbook II. Not tied to measurable goals/objs.	None

Survey of State Laws/Decre
Activities Relating to Specifi
Concept of Educational Acc

	TEACHER EVALUATION	IN-SERVICE EDUCATION	TEACHER CENTERS	TENURE
ALABAMA	By law - successful exp. first year.	St. Bd. resolution for approved local plans	4 USOE nominations. 2 pilot intern centers	Tenure
ALASKA	No	10 days authorized by law in state approved plan	None	Tenure
ARIZONA	By law (SB1294, 1972 - ?)	Considering - for recertification	Mesa, Phoenix, Tucson - in planning stages	Tenure ing con dismiss
ARKANSAS	Successful exp. for cert. renewal	Salary purposes	No	Fair E 1970, re
CALIFORNIA	Stull Bill (AB293, 1971)	CTA spons'g legis. reqmt. Fifth-year requirement	Santa Clara Cty - planning	Stull Bi
COLORADO	1971 Accountability Act - part of staff and program evaluation phase.	Part of program development phase. Credit allowed toward certificate renewal.	Consortium of Bds. of Cooperative Services, colleges and universities, and model districts — planning stage	Separa contrac Bill to a
CONNECTICUT	Successful exp. for cont'g or adv certification.	Local function.	Hartford District (LEA) - Teacher Interaction Learning Center	Tenur
DELAWARE	No	Reqmt planned - for cont'g ed for certificate renewal		Tenur
FLORIDA		District master plans - by State Board resolution 1970		Tenur
GEORGIA	Legislation proposed; did not pass	1 sch. model being developed - may lead to state plan	Metropolitan Atlanta Portal Schs.-Atlanta TC Consort. Atlanta Instr. Services Ctr. Savannah-Armstrong St. Cols. Cons. Ga. Southern College West Ga. Teacher Education Ctr.	Tenure
HAWAII	For probationary teachers	Voluntary	Discussion	Tenur
IDAHO	No	No	Boise	Contin
ILLINOIS	Local plans proposed by cert'n task force	Local plans proposed by cert'n task force		Tenur
INDIANA	No	No	No	Tenur
IOWA		Pilot project - for continuing certification	5 experimental staff development ctrs. for certificate renewal; teacher centers planned	Contin
KANSAS	Legislation drafted	Discussion - for p.-b. certificate renewal	6 USOE nominations	Tenure in contract tion prop
KENTUCKY	No	Existing law enables state plan. Current attention to allowing in-service toward fifth-year requirement.		Tenure la
LOUISIANA	Move toward; now req'd for advanced certificate	Proposed for recertification	Receiving attention in connx'n with recertification	Tenure la

/Decrees/Requirements
Specific Areas Included in the
nal Accountability

TENURE/CONT'G CONTRACT	P.-B. CERTIFICATION	PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	TEACHER NEEDS ASSMT.
Tenure law. No continuing contract	State Board resolution urges institutions to initiate p.-b. training	None statewide. Livingston Univ. -based on Syracuse training model	Perm. Study Com'n for Educ. Tit III
Tenure	No		2 St Dept pilots
Tenure law - provides for continuing contracts and due process-fair dismissal	3 state univs. developing p.-b. teacher education	No	EPDA - planning
Fair Employment-Dismissal Act, 1970, revision before legis.	No	No	AEA
Stull Bill	Com'n Tchr Prep & Lic'g study	No	NEA
Separate tenure law; continuing contract for all practical purposes. Bill to abolish tenure introduced.	Under study.	No	Part of needs assessment phase
Tenure law	Proposal adopted by State Board; legislation proposed.	No	
Tenure law	No	No	Title III
Tenure	Under consideration		
Tenure law proposed; did not pass	TE Council to revise program approval criteria to p.-b.	In progress	Ga. Assessment Program
Tenure	In modified sense, thru approved-program approach.	No	1966 Curriculum Survey, Pr Speak-up, Project Assess
Continuing contract law	Study and exploration by Prof'l Stds Commission	No	By St Dept
Tenure law	Proposed by Task Force on Certification	At Governors State Univ.	No
Tenure law	No		No
Continuing contract law	No	No	No
Tenure in 3 large cities. Continuing contract law. Due process legislation proposed.	Prof'l Teaching Stds Advisory Board studying alternative certification methods	No	Three districts - Kansas Proje Project SEEK (State Educa Evaluation of Kans.)
Tenure law	Institutions may attest to competency in lieu of credits	No	
Tenure law	State Dept model p.-b. teacher education program	Model developed; position paper in process.	Title I

CONNECTICUT	Successful exp. for cont'g or adv certification.	Local function.	Hartford District (LEA) - Teacher Interaction Learning Center	Tenure law
DELAWARE	No	Reqmt planned - for cont'g ed for certificate renewal		Tenure law
FLORIDA		District master plans - by State Board resolution 1970		Tenure
GEORGIA	Legislation proposed; did not pass	1 sch. model being developed - may lead to state plan	Metropolitan Atlanta Portal Schs.-Atlanta TC Consort. Atlanta Instr. Services Ctr. Savannah-Armstrong St. Cols. Cons. Ga. Southern College West Ga. Teacher Education Ctr.	Tenure law
HAWAII	For probationary teachers	Voluntary	Discussion	Tenure
IDAHO	No	No	Boise	Continuing
ILLINOIS	Local plans proposed by cert'n task force.	Local plans proposed by cert'n task force		Tenure law
INDIANA	No	No	No	Tenure law
IOWA		Pilot project - for continuing certification	5 experimental staff development ctrs. for certificate renewal; teacher centers planned	Continuing
KANSAS	Legislation drafted	Discussion - for p.-b. certificate renewal	6 USOE nominations	Tenure in 3 l contract law. tion proposed
KENTUCKY	No	Existing law enables state plan. Current attention to allowing in-service toward fifth-year requirement.		Tenure law
LOUISIANA	Move toward; now req'd for advanced certificate	Proposed for recertification	Receiving attention in connx'n with recertification	Tenure law
MAINE	Proposed prof pract legis.	Proposed prof pract legis.	4 under development	Two-year cor
MARYLAND	Art. 77 - biennially, for classification of cert.	Allowed toward fifth-year requirement	25 for cooperating teachers - open to all	Teacher cor State Board Community contract.
MASSACHUSETTS	Legislation filed (H77)	No		Tenure
MICHIGAN	St. Bd. resolution for developing program	State Board endorsed state-aided local programs; no funds appropriated yet	4 USOE nominations. Various center-type activities	Tenure Act
MINNESOTA	Under study	Allowed toward certificate renewal; five-year c.-b. recertification plan effective 1973	No	Tenure and laws.
MISSISSIPPI	No	No	No	No
MISSOURI	No	Some local - salary purposes	No	Tenure law
MONTANA	St. Bd. requirement	No	NSF funded regional centers for math teachers	Tenure law.
NEBRASKA	No	For certificate renewal	Univ. of Neb.-Lincoln Schools	Tenure - Lin ing contract f
NEVADA	No	No	Expected	Limited form

Tenure law	Proposal adopted by State Board; legislation proposed.	No	
Tenure law	No	No	Title III
Tenure	Under consideration		
Tenure law proposed; did not pass	TE Council to revise program approval criteria to p.-b.	In progress	Ga. Assessment Program
Tenure	In modified sense, thru approved-program approach.	No	1966 Curriculum Survey, Projec Speak-up, Project Assess
Continuing contract law	Study and exploration by Prof'l Stds Commission	No	By St Dept
Tenure law	Proposed by Task Force on Certification	At Governors State Univ.	No
Tenure law	No		No
Continuing contract law	No	No	No
Tenure in 3 large cities. Continuing contract law. Due process legislation proposed.	Prof'l Teaching Stds Advisory Board studying alternative certification methods.	No	Three districts - Kansas Project '7 Project SEEK (State Education Evaluation of Kans.)
Tenure law	Institutions may attest to competency in lieu of credits	No	
Tenure law	State Dept model p.-b. teacher education program	Model developed; position paper in process.	Title I
Two-year continuing contract.	Proposed Prof Pract Legis.	No	St Dept-N.E. Project in TE jointly
Teacher contracts prescribed in State Board bylaws. Frederick Cty. Community Col. has continuing contract.	Plan in developing stage.	Being considered as Stds Board project.	No
Tenure	Legislation filed (H77) - certification after 2 years based on competency evaluation.		No
Tenure Act	Through approved-program approach. Model p.-b. program funded for 1972-73.	No	State Bd endorsed prof'l develop ment legislation; not funded yet.
Tenure and continuing contract laws.	All new regulations require specified competence and evaluation. State Board pushing p.-b. teacher education.	Being developed in several fields and at several colleges.	"Teacher factors" in student pe formance to be considered
No	No	No	By St Dept
Tenure law	No	No	School finance study under way.
Tenure law. Continuing contract	No	No	No
Tenure - Lincoln/Omaha. Continuing contract for all schools.	Through approved-program approach.	No	No
Limited form of tenure	No	Some move toward	

	STUDENT NEEDS ASSMT.	STANDARDIZED TESTING	SCH. PROGRAM EVAL'N	G
LABAMA	Perm. Study Com'n for Educ. Title III	Yes	Developing state model	
LASKA	2 St Dept pilots			
RIZONA	Art. 2.1, 1969 . . . . . Ch. 168, SB 1294, 1972.	3rd grade - reading Basics - eval'n system by 1975	Ch.168, SB 1294, 1972 - by 1975	
RKANSAS	Title III	8th grade - St. Dept. guid/counsl'g div. 4th, 9th, 12th grades	Accreditation	
ALIFORNIA	School Testing Program Act, 1961, amended . . . . . (legislation introduced to modify, 1972) Basic Reading Act of 1965	Basics, intelligence, performance, selected content; grades 6 and 12 Grades 1-3	School Testing Act Stull Bill - maybe	
OLORADO	Part of needs assessment phase.	Not sole criteria.	Part of evaluation phase.	
ONNECTICUT			General statutes - effective 1973; HB 537 - legislative review cte. In connx'n with p.-b. cert'n.	
ELAWARE	Title III	Grades 1, 4, 8 in 1973 - basics, attitudes, career knowledge, health, citizenship	Edl Auditing System; Edl Acc'y System	
LORIDA	Evaluation law (Ch.70-399, S.9(1), 1970) Accountability Act (HB894, 1971). . .	Basics, other subjects	Accountability Act Evaluation law	
EORGIA	Georgia Assessment Program	St. Bd. mandates testing specific grades		
AWAII	1966 Curriculum Survey, Project Speak-up, Project Assess, Title III	Yes; 1972 Senate Resolution, Concurrent House Resolution to revise reporting procedures.	Exec.Budget Act (1970) Pilot 1972-73 Accreditation	
DAHO	By St Dept	No	St.Dept. estab. eva'n div. Accreditation	
LLINOIS	Title III SB 1430.	Would limit info from norm-ref. tests	Revised minimum stds.	
NDIANA	No		No	
OWA	Coop'g with federal program. Title III - science	Yes	St Dept planning	
ANSAS	Kansas Project '76, Project SEEK	St Dept program - 5th grade reading, 8th grade achievement	SB501 enables eval'n linked to accred'n	
ENTUCKY	Kentucky Educational Needs Assessment Study Phase II: Learner Needs		New accred'n plan	
OUISIANA	Title I			
	10-year program begun, adapting . . .			

SCH. PROGRAM EVAL'N	GOALS/OBJECTIVES	MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	RELATIONSHIP TO ST. FUNDING
Developing state model	St.Bd.resol'n-personnel development plan St. Dept. has adopted	Some MIS in St. Dept.	Little
Ch.168, SB 1294, 1972 - by 1975	Ch.168, SB 1294, 1972; Some st/local activity	Uniform cost acctg by 1973	Funding under study
Accreditation	St. Dept.	MBO - St Dept	
School Testing Act Stull Bill - maybe	Jt. legislative cte hearings	PPBS bill pending	Little
Part of evaluation phase.	Part of program development phase.	Yes	None
General statutes - effective 1973; HB 537 - legislative review cte. In connx'n with p.-b. cert'n.	In connx'n with p.-b. certification	Under study	
Edl Auditing System; Edl Acc'y System	Goals adopted; objs being developed.	PPBS pilot testing in 3 districts	None
Accountability Act Evaluation law	Accountability Act Evaluation law		
	Some local activity		
Exec.Budget Act (1970) Pilot 1972-73 Accreditation	Exec. Budget Act	Exec. Budget Act mandates PPBS	Testimony to support funding requests
St.Dept. estab. eva'n div. Accreditation	No		None
Revised minimum stds.	SB 1548	SB 1548	None
No		PL309 - PPBS operational by 1977	
St Dept planning	No	Some districts considering	None
SB501 enables eval'n linked to accred'n	SDE regulation	In St Dept. Ass'n drafted legislation - not reported out	St. funding based largely on teacher prep'n/experience will change to per pupil/per teacher.
New accred'n plan			
	Move toward acc'y legislation	St Dept uses MIS, MBO	Acc'y legislation will provide

CONNECTICUT			General statutes - effective 1973; HB 537 - legislative review cte. In connx'n with p.-b. cert'n.
DELAWARE	Title III	Grades 1, 4, 8 in 1973 - basics, attitudes, career knowledge, health, citizenship	Edl Auditing System; Edl Acc'y System
FLORIDA	Evaluation law (Ch.70-399, S.9(1), 1970) Accountability Act (HB894, 1971). . .	Basics, other subjects	Accountability Act Evaluation law
GEORGIA	Georgia Assessment Program	St. Bd. mandates testing specific grades	
HAWAII	1966 Curriculum Survey, Project Speak-up, Project Assess, Title III	Yes; 1972 Senate Resolution, Concurrent House Resolution to revise reporting procedures.	Exec.Budget Act (1970) Pilot 1972-73 Accreditation
IDAHO	By St Dept	No	St.Dept. estab. eva'n div. Accreditation
ILLINOIS	Title III SB 1430.	Would limit info from norm-ref. tests	Revised minimum stds.
INDIANA	No		No
IOWA	Coop'g with federal program. Title III - science	Yes	St Dept planning
KANSAS	Kansas Project '76, Project SEEK	St Dept program - 5th grade reading, 8th grade achievement	SB501 enables eval'n linked to accred'n
KENTUCKY	Kentucky Educational Needs Assessment Study Phase II: Learner Needs		New accred'n plan
LOUISIANA	Title I		
MAINE	10-year program begun, adapting. . . national assessment	Yes	Accreditation
MARYLAND	SB 166, 1972 (accountability . . . . . act)	Basics, other areas. Effort toward criterion-ref. reading tests	Accountability Act
MASSACHUSETTS	Willis-Harrington Act (Ch. 572, 1965)	No	
MICHIGAN	Michigan Assessment Program (Act 306, 1969; 38, 1970).	Basic skills assessment battery 4th and 7th grades	St. Bd. accountability position stmt
MINNESOTA	Beginning		Beginning
MISSISSIPPI	By St Dept	Yes	Accreditation
MISSOURI	School finance study	No	Classification Stds being revised
MONTANA	Title III	Title III differential aptitude testing program available to public/private school students, grades 8/9.	Sch/Community Assistance Program Accreditation
NEBRASKA	LB 959, 1969	Criterion-ref. to skills and concepts, grades 4, 5, 6 in eleven areas.	LB 959
NEVADA			Developing model

General statutes - effective 1973; HB 537 - legislative review cte. In connx'n with p.-b. cert'n.	In connx'n with p.-b. certification	Under study	
Edl Auditing System; Edl Acc'y System	Goals adopted; objs being developed.	PPBS pilot testing in 3 districts	None
Accountability Act Evaluation law	Accountability Act Evaluation law		
	Some local activity		
Exec.Budget Act (1970) Pilot 1972-73 Accreditation	Exec. Budget Act	Exec. Budget Act mandates PPBS	Testimony to support funding requests
St.Dept. estab. eva'n div. Accreditation	No		None
Revised minimum stds.	SB 1548	SB 1548	None
No		PL309 - PPBS operational by 1977	
St Dept planning	No	Some districts considering	None
SB501 enables eval'n linked to accred'n	SDE regulation	In St Dept. Ass'n drafted legislation - not reported out	St. funding based largely on teacher prep'n/experience will change to per pupil/per teacher.
New accred'n plan			
	Move toward acc'y legislation	St Dept uses MIS, MBO	Acc'y legislation will provide
Accreditation	Accreditation	No	N/A
Accountability Act	Accountability Act	Development work	None
	State Board requirement	Bur. of School Mgmt Services, St Dept	None
St. Bd. accountability position stmt	St. Bd. accountability position stmt	No	No direct relationship
Beginning	Beginning	Larger districts restructuring	None
Accreditation	No	No	None
Classification Stds being revised	No	No	None
Sch/Community Assistance Program Accreditation	Sch/Community Assistance Program Accreditation	No	None
LB 959	St.Bd. adopted goals 1971	Trend toward	
Developing model	No	No	None